

REMARKS

This Response and Amendment is filed in response to the Office Action dated November 3, 2005.

In the Office Action, claims 2-4, 6-12 and 14-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 4,563,814 (Trichell et al.), JP Patent No. 402152491A (Kiyama et al.), and U.S. Patent No. 6,473,973 (Laube).

In this response, Applicants have canceled claims 1-20 and added new claims 21-40. Based upon this amendment, the rejection to claims 2-4, 6-12 and 14-20 is no longer applicable. At least independent claims 21, 33 and 35 do not teach, suggest or disclose the subject matter disclosed in the references previously relied upon in the Office actions.

Independent claims 21, 33 and 35 all require a movable upper blade for a clipper blade set, the blade including a forward edge with a series of teeth extending there along, a rearward edge, and an upper surface having a pair of upper reinforcing protrusions extending upwardly from the upper surface. A generally planar lower surface extends rearward of the forward edge and is supported by the upper surface of the fixed blade. The lower surface defines a pair of lower reinforcing rims coplanar with the lower surface and including a pair of recessed portions, each recessed portion extending outwardly from a respective one of the lower reinforcing rims and being recessed from the lower surface. The blade also includes a drive notch having two substantially parallel walls extending between the upper and lower surfaces, each upper reinforcing protrusion being disposed adjacent a respective one of the substantially parallel walls and each lower reinforcing rim forming a portion of a respective one of the substantially parallel walls.

Trichell et al. discloses a movable blade 6, but does not include any figures showing, or disclosure describing, the configuration of a bottom surface of movable blade 6. The bottom surface of blade 6 includes an integral ridge 22 adjacent a rear edge 24 of blade 6. However, as can be seen in Figs. 1 and 3, Trichell et al. does not disclose the bottom surface of blade 6 including a generally planar surface extending rearward of the forward edge, a pair of integrally formed lower reinforcing rims co-planar with the planar surface and forming a portion of one of the parallel walls, or a pair of recessed portions extending outwardly from a respective one of the rims, as required by independent claims 21, 33 and 35.

Kiyama et al. illustrates blades 2 and 3 for a shaver. Shaver blade 2 illustrated in Kiyama et al. is planar with an opening extending between upper and lower surfaces of the blade. Further, there are substantial structural differences between the movable blade 30 of a hair clipper as set forth in the claims of the present application, and the shaver blade 2 of Kiyama et al. Shaver blade 2 is a substantially U-shaped blade and does not include any protrusions or recessed portions on either surface of the blade.

In Laube, an upper cutting blade 15 includes a lower surface of upper cutting blade 15, as shown in FIGS. 2, 3, 4 and 4a. As can be seen in the figures, Laube does not teach or suggest a lower surface of upper blade 15 including a generally planar surface extending rearward of the forward edge, a pair of integrally formed lower reinforcing rims co-planar with the planar surface and forming a portion of one of the parallel walls, or a pair of recessed portions extending outwardly from a respective one of the rims, as required by independent claims 21, 33 and 35.

None of the references previously relied upon by the Examiner teach or suggest all of the claim limitations of at least independent claims 21, 33 and 35. Neither Trichell et al., Kiyama et al.,

or Laube, in combination or individually, teach or suggest a movable blade for a hair clipper including an upper surface or a generally planar lower surface as required by the claims. Namely, none of the references teach or suggest a generally planar lower surface extending rearward of the forward edge and defining a pair of lower reinforcing rims co-planar with the lower surface and including a pair of recessed portions, each recessed portion extending outwardly from a respective one of the lower reinforcing rims and being recessed from the lower surface. Nor do the references teach or suggest the upper surface having a pair of upper reinforcing protrusions extending upwardly from the upper surface, wherein a drive notch of the blade includes two substantially parallel walls extending between the upper and lower surfaces and each upper reinforcing protrusion is disposed adjacent a respective one of the substantially parallel walls and each lower reinforcing rim forms a portion of a respective one of the substantially parallel walls.

Claims 22-32, 34 and 36-40 depend from allowable claims 21, 33 and 35, respectively and are therefore allowable as well.

In view of the amendments presented herein, Applicant believes that the claims as filed are in condition for allowance and respectfully requests a timely Notice of Allowance be issued for this case. Applicant kindly requests that the Examiner telephone the attorney of record in the event a telephone discussion would be helpful in advancing the prosecution of the present application.

Respectfully submitted,



Gayle A. Bush
Reg. No. 52,677

File No. 012021-9219-00
Michael Best & Friedrich LLP
100 East Wisconsin Avenue
Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53202-4108
(414) 223-2509